THEOLOGY

VOL. LV AUGUST, 1952 No. 386

Editorial

IN his sermon on "Christ's Words and Christian Society", Dean Church said that "it seems impossible to conceive three things more opposite at first sight to the Sermon on the Mount than War, Law, and Trade; yet Christian society has long since made up its mind about them, and we all accept them as among the necessities and occupations of human society. . . . Even the sect which denounces war and titles has not shrunk from the inconsistency, at least as great, of being rich."[1] It is fair to say that in our time the question of the Christian attitude to war has, for obvious enough reasons, received a disproportionate amount of attention in comparison with the prior and fundamental question of the Christian attitude to civilization and culture. This may be partly because the conception of civilization or culture is less easy to comprehend and there is no general agreement even about the meaning of the terms. The virtue of Dr Richard Niebuhr's fascinating and deeply interesting book, *Christ and Culture*,[2] is not that he propounds new solutions of perennial problems, but that he analyses and differentiates, more clearly and profoundly than has been done heretofore, the various ways in which representative Christians in the past have understood their duty with regard to the life of this transitory world. He makes the familiar distinction between "world-affirmation" and "world-renunciation" seem quite jejune.[3]

As he uses the terms "culture" and "civilization", they are practically synonymous. Culture "comprises language, habits, ideas, beliefs, customs, social organization, inherited artifacts, technical processes, and values" (p. 46). Culture is what man superimposes on the natural. "A river is nature, a canal culture; a raw piece of quartz is nature, an arrowhead culture; a moan is natural, a word cultural. Culture is the work of men's minds and hands" (p. 47). Christians acknowledge Christ to be the final revelation of the Word and Will of God; how then ought they to assess the whole field of culture with its manifold and ever-developing claims?

Dr Niebuhr distinguishes five typical answers to this question, while he constantly warns himself and his readers against "the danger of confusing hypothetical types with the rich variety and the colour-

[1] R. W. Church, *The Gifts of Civilization* (1892), pp. 34 f. [2] Faber, 21s.

[3] He points out that there are many other examples of too simple bisection. "Efforts at analysis in any sphere are subject to the temptation to distinguish just two classes of persons, things, or movements. Rightly to divide seems to mean to bisect. Existent things, we think, must be either spiritual or physical; the spiritual either rational or irrational, the physical either matter or motion. Therefore when we try to understand Christianity, we divide its adherents into the 'once-born' and the 'twice-born', its communities into churches or sects . . ." (p. 123).

ful individuality of historical persons" (p. 126). With this proviso, then, there is first the type that emphasizes the opposition between Christ and culture, which can be given the title: "Christ against Culture". Of this type, the First Epistle of St John, Tertullian, and Tolstoy, are taken as examples. The second type sees a fundamental agreement and possibility of accommodation between Christ and culture—"The Christ of Culture"; the Gnostics, Abelard, Locke, and Ritschl, among others, exemplify various aspects of this type. The third type takes the differences between the claims of Christ and culture more seriously than the second type, yet at the same time it stands for a synthesis between them: "Christ above Culture". Clement of Alexandria, St Thomas Aquinas (*par excellence*), and Bishop Butler are representatives of it. The fourth type, described as dualist, holds the claims of Christ and culture in a dialectical tension: "Christ and Culture in Paradox". St. Paul, Marcion, Luther and Troeltsch exemplify it in one way or another. The fifth type, described as conversionist, while recognizing the opposition between Christ and all human institutions, nevertheless sees him as the transformer of society in history, and not only beyond history: "Christ the Transformer of Culture". The Fourth Gospel, St Augustine, and F. D. Maurice are representatives of it.

So bald a summary gives no idea of the many kinds of illumination which this classification of historical types brings out, nor of the way in which Dr Niebuhr traces these different types to their deepest theological roots, nor again of his perception that "no person or group ever conforms completely to a type" (p. 56) and that those who are taken to represent one type often have affinities with one or more of the others.

Some readers will be disappointed at Dr Niebuhr's inconclusiveness, for with a rare impartiality he directs attention to the strong and weak points in each of the typical answers which Christians in the course of history have given to the main question, and he does not commit himself to any one solution. But in a final chapter he justifies this inconclusiveness by the consideration that we must not expect to find our own course in the present time prescribed by any single precedent; we have to find our own way of reconciling the claims of Christ and culture in free dependence on the Holy Spirit who can bring out of his treasure things new as well as old. Study of typical answers given in the past can reveal to us the nature and implications of the decisions we have to take, and at the same time prevent us from absolutizing our own or anyone else's solutions. "We have not found and shall not find—until Christ comes again—a Christian in history whose faith so ruled his life that every thought was brought into subjection to it and every moment and place was for him in the kingdom of God" (p. 234).

Christian Apologetics

THE enterprise of Christian apologetics has often been criticized. Sometimes this is because the word "apologetics" suggests, for those

whose Latin is weak, an effort to hold the fort when all chance of victory by offensive action is lost. But the Latin word itself comes close to meaning "reasonable justification"; and if it is defence at all, it is defence in a way very different from the whispered and timid apology of popular thought. It is defence in a bold and daring manner, in the sure confidence that Christianity can meet and overcome opposition because in it is the very truth of God himself. Sometimes, and more particularly by certain theologians of our own times, apologetics has been derided or denounced, because it is felt to be an attempt to build up a case for our faith on grounds that are ultimately secular or humanistic—*merely* philosophical, *purely* natural. This is the attack of men like Karl Barth, who regard any such enterprise as both blasphemous and absurd. Of course we must concede (unless we subscribe to what for many of us is the impossible position of the Vatican Council of 1870) at least part of their point—namely, that we cannot, from the human side alone, without divine grace, reach to the eternal God. Yet we must at the same time insist that the God whom we worship, and by whom we have been given newness of life in Christ Jesus, is the God of cosmic order, of right reason, of ultimate truth; and therefore it is unthinkable for us that the effort to state what reason we have for our Christian position is bound to be a meaningless and fruitless labour, with which God is not pleased. Despite our sin, God is in our understanding, chastened as we must be in our trust in its deliverances.

But the erroneous extreme of the Barthian attack ought to make us conscious of two facts: one, that Christian apologetics is not simply another name for ordinary philosophy of religion; and second, that it is only from within the household of faith that we can speak as apologists, and then always with that humility which becomes those whose speaking is of the ineffable mystery of God and his ways with men.

Those who have read the Apologists, those early Greek and Latin Christians who sought to present Christianity to the Graeco-Roman world of the first few centuries of the Christian era, will recall that they had three great objectives. First, the negative one of forcing their hearers to a rejection of idolatry, to turn "to the living God from dead idols"; second, and as a consequence, the positive objective of proclaiming the existence of the one true God; and third, the central affirmation—which some of them reached only by intimation, so busy were they on the earlier levels—of the truth of God's revelation to, and redemption of, the world in Jesus Christ. Classically in Origen's great *Contra Celsum* this threefold task is set forth; but it persisted, and nearly a century later, in Lactantius for instance, we find the same intention implicitly expressed.

I have no intention of minimizing the long period of Christian thought between these apologists and our own day. But in our own day, when once more we who are Christians confront a pagan world, our task can rightly be said to be exactly the same as theirs. First of all, we must show, with all the clarity cast by the light of the gospel, the idolatry of our time—its setting up of nationalism, racism, vulgar

materialism, the "bitch-goddess" success, communism, yes and Americanism too, as if they were exhaustive and adequate expressions of the meaning of human existence. We must demonstrate the utter inadequacy of these false gods; we must overthrow them. But, second, we cannot stop with this destructive work. We must proclaim, unfalteringly, and show (so far as this can be done), by all the devices and arguments at our disposal, that it is only in the one true and living God, the God of the Jewish Church, the God of the Prophets, who is the God and Father of all men, that life can be given significance and purpose. And we must claim the whole world as his world, a world which the worship of idols distorts and perverts, but which the recognition of the true God restores to its right dignity and order. And thirdly and most important, we must declare the gospel of God in Christ, the faith in the incarnate and redeeming Lord in his Holy Church, as that which alone can bring final purpose to our human existence and empower men to live as men in a world where under present conditions they are almost forced to live as sophisticated yet frustrated beasts. But we can do the first two of these things, in a fashion which is proper for *Christian* apologists, only if we are ourselves committed to the last of them.

The task of Christian apologetics is a *churchly* task, as the discipline itself is a churchly discipline. By this I mean that we who seek to defend the faith must always be those who, in giving a reason, are believing men, men of the Church, participants in the life of the divine community for whose faith we would speak. It is not our duty, on the basis of a world understood entirely apart from God's mighty act in Christ and the Church which is bearer of and witness to that act, to construct a world-view which will perhaps admit the possibility of some such theism as Christianity assumes and therefore will perhaps admit the further possibility of the Christian position itself. It is our task and joy to see the whole world, and all of life, in the light of our major commitment. It is our privilege to interpret the whole world, and all of life, in terms of the central affirmation of God in Christ for man's wholeness. It is our obligation to claim, in consequence of this affirmation, that the God whom we know and adore in the incarnate and redeeming Lord, in his Body the Holy Church, is the Lord also of the whole world, and of all life. We have a position; we start from there. In a profound sense, then, it is true that the best apologetic *for* Christianity is a compelling statement *of* it.

But there is more than that. For we are to seek to commend this faith, this worship, this engraced life in Christ, to a non-believing world. It is, therefore, our duty to find ways of stating the Christian position as winningly, as attractively, as we can. In so doing, we must remember the distinction between peripheral and essential, lest we clutter the faith with irrelevancies which to many can be a needless cause of stumbling; we must remember with Erasmus that the articles of faith must be as few as are necessary to the facts; we must remember above all that we do not have all the answers, since we talk of a great mystery which no man can fully know, no mind com-

pletely fathom. And in this seeking to commend, it is our great responsibility to find words, phrases, an idiom, which will not in itself present semantic difficulties to those whom we would win. For is it not true that much, although not most, of our trouble today is that the words which for us within the great tradition are richly significant, are for those without often meaningless babble or offensive chatter? Yet the Christian faith is not in *words*, but in the power of God; and it is incumbent upon us to discover the ways of stating that power which will open men's minds and win men's hearts, and so bring them into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

What are the qualities of spirit which must mark him who would be an apologist for Christianity? First of all, we must be men of strong conviction. We must know whom we have believed; we must be persuaded that he is able to keep, and to do, that which he has promised. The way to such conviction is simply the way of Christian discipleship—the way of prayer, of sacramental life, of meditation on the Scriptures, of dedication and perseverance in our course. But the way to such conviction is also an intellectual way; we must know the faith, know it through study and thought, know it so deeply and so well that we know it not with our minds alone but in the whole of our being.

Secondly, we who would be apologists for Christianity must be men of humility. Not only is the gospel of God greater than our little minds, but we must ever think and talk as those who know this to be the fact. The limitless ocean of God's being, the amazing depths of human personality, the strange and wonderful ways of relationship between man and man, and between God and man—here are areas of life and experience of which we may speak only with the hesitation born of humble recognition, yet with genuine conviction born of faith. The light which is Christ shineth, but we dare not forget that it shineth "in darkness". Much we do not know, much we can never know. We must accept that fact, and the further fact that every man to whom we talk is a mystery, into whose secret heart we can never enter, whose inner life we must reverence as a place where God dwells. So we can never seek to manipulate men, twist them to our ways of thinking, cheat them in argument, or coerce them by some wrong pressure, intellectual or even personal. We must commend the faith through that humility of spirit, as through that integrity of mind and honesty of argument, which alone can reflect something of the mystery of Truth in a world great beyond our seeing.

Finally, we must be men of sensitivity, of generosity, of charity. The eternal reality of God is a goodness ever diffusive of itself: so we read in the Angelic Doctor. We, who are little and derived creatures, must reflect something of that overflowing charity, that boundless generosity. We must be sensitive to the widest reaches of the divine self-disclosure. God is speaking in many places *not* specifically religious; as O. C. Quick said, God works in many an unrecognized Bethlehem and Calvary. He even works outside the Holy Catholic Church, difficult as it seems for some of us, evidently, to recognize

the fact. And although we must be ready to "show up" the pretensions of "worldly wisdom", we must also remember that our God is the God by whom all things were made through his Eternal Word. That Word is incarnate for us men in Christ, but he is at work *everywhere* in divers portions, in partial revelation and adumbrated redemption. He is met in response, everywhere, by the Holy Spirit, who everywhere presses the creation home to God, the Spirit who is the great and everlasting Amen through created things to the God who created them, even though he be uniquely known in the holy community which is marked by his "fellowship". Generosity of spirit in recognizing and accepting these facts will make a world of difference in our way of being apologists.

And as to other men whom we would win—other Christians and non-Christians—can we fail to be in charity towards them, loving them because God made them, because God loves them, because God keeps them, because God has bought them, and all men, with the precious blood of our Saviour? If we are Christian, we dare not be bitter in spirit towards any brother for whom Christ died. Rather, we must seek, in all humility but with all love, to win him to the saving Lord in his Holy Church, remembering that we too are sinners, we too are blind, we too are weak, yet thankful that God has called us out of darkness into his marvellous light, graciously willing to unite us in his Son's mystical Body with that Son of his love and so to call us by his name. Often enough, it will not be by word said, but by charity shown, that we shall most effectively commend the gospel of God in Christ, most certainly win others to faithful membership in Christ's mystical Body. And this is why our apologetic must be ecumenical in spirit, as the word goes, willing to learn and willing to share with all who profess and call themselves Christian, even while we remain loyal sons of *ecclesia anglicana*, Catholic and reformed, and are prepared vigorously to defend the doctrine, discipline, and worship of Christ's Holy Catholic Church as this church has received and maintains the same.

W. Norman Pittenger.

The Heavenly Session of Christ

It is the teaching of the New Testament and of the "Apostles' Creed" that Jesus "ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty". What is the significance of the assertion of his heavenly Session at the Father's right hand?

First we must note that there is one exception to the general New Testament teaching concerning the Session. In Acts 7. 55–56 we read that the martyr Stephen "saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God". It may be that the exalted Lord is here thought of as *standing* in honour of his martyr or in readiness to come to his succour or to welcome him.

Elsewhere the New Testament always represents the ascended

Jesus as *sitting* on the divine throne at God's right hand. It seems hardly necessary to insist that the Session is always conceived as taking place *after* the Ascension. Yet it is important to stress this, because recent exegesis of Mark 14. 62 proceeds upon the contrary assumption. The high-priest asked Jesus: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." Many scholars (W. Manson, M. J. Lagrange, V. Taylor, W. K. Lowther Clarke, T. F. Glasson, A. M. Hunter, and others) assert that as the words "coming with the clouds of heaven" echo Dan. 7. 13, they must be intended in Mark 14. 62, as in the Danielic passage, to signify an *ascent* to the presence of God. According to this astonishing interpretation, therefore, in Mark 14. 62 the Session is represented as taking place *before* the Ascension. This is impossible. The Session is always, and inevitably, represented by the New Testament as taking place *after* the Ascension. It fills the interval between the Ascension and the Parousia.

We may now specify five aspects in which the New Testament writers interpret the Session.

(1) *As a fulfilment of Psalm* 110. 1: "The Lord said unto my lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (cf. Matt. 22. 44; Mark 12. 36; Luke 20. 42; Acts 2. 34; Heb. 1. 13; etc.). The belief that the honorific titles of Psalm 110, regarded as predictions, were fulfilled in our Lord's Exaltation and Session was widespread in the doctrine of the primitive Church. The Psalm was thought to be prophetic of the Ascension (Acts 2. 34), of the Session (Heb. 1. 13; 10. 12–13), and of the eternal High-priesthood "after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. 6. 20; 7. 17, 21). The tradition that the practice of quoting Psalm 110. 1 in reference to his own Person goes back to Jesus himself is defended by many scholars (e.g. by A. E. J. Rawlinson, in his Commentary on St Mark's Gospel, at 12. 36).

(2) *As a symbol of triumphant sovereignty.* The warfare of the Cross (Col. 2. 15; Eph. 2. 14–16; Heb. 2. 14) has issued in the victory of the Exaltation, and of the completeness of this victory the Session is the symbol. The Throne on which Jesus sits is the Throne of God himself. His sovereignty is unassailable, eternal, divine. The Son of God who for sinners stooped from the highest to the lowest, even from the Throne of God to the malefactor's cross of shame, was raised from his self-humiliation in suffering and death, and exalted to the divine and heavenly Throne whence he came (cf. Phil. 2. 6–11). Jesus is the rightful Ruler of mankind and of the universe (1 Cor. 15. 25; cf. Ps. 110. 1), yet subordinate and obedient to the Father (1 Cor. 15. 28). He has triumphed over sin and death and all the forces of evil.

(3) *As a symbol of peace and rest.* "The image of the Session is that of perfect rest" (Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 52); that is, rest from all pain and sorrow. "Weariness and pain have no place in the life of the unincarnate Godhead" (Swete, *The Ascended Christ*, pp. 13–14). But he is not at rest from warfare and work. He is at rest from the pangs of humiliation, shame, suffering, and death, but the enemy,

though defeated and mortally wounded, is still at large and has yet to be extinguished. The Exalted Lord knows the peace that comes from work well done, a worthy purpose effectively accomplished, and the assurance of final triumph. But the campaign goes on, and will do so, until all is subjected unto him (1 Cor 15. 25–28). Long and hard may be his warfare, in which Christians are called to share, equipped with the whole armour of God (Eph. 6. 10–20), but the decisive victory has been won, and the ultimate extinction of evil is assured.

(4) *As a symbol of Intercession.* The Exalted Christ, who is at God's right hand (cf. 1 Pet. 3. 21–22), "also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8. 34). "It is only by the continued offering of himself in the new life of his resurrection-state that his people are taken 'in him' beyond death into heavenly and eternal life" (W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, 2nd ed. 1884, p. 142). By virtue of Christ's heavenly intercession and mediation Christians share already his resurrection-life, of which an earnest has been given in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. As Aquinas expressed it: "*Christus sua passione meruit nobis introitum regni coelestis et impedimentum removit; sed per suam ascensionem nos quasi in possessionem regni coelestis introduxit*" (*Summ. Theol.*, Pt. III, Q. 49. 5. 3). Christ's saving work, initiated by the reconciliation effected upon the Cross, is continued by his intercession, and will be fully accomplished at the consummation.

Christ, like Melchizedek, is both King and Priest. It is as heavenly and divine High-Priest that he intercedes. Since he is priest for ever, his intercession also is permanent (Heb. 7. 24–27). He can therefore carry through to completion ("to the uttermost") every case in which he intercedes. Intercession is the essence of his heavenly life. The intercession of Christ is not merely a prayer, but a life. "The New Testament does not represent him as an '*orante*', standing ever before the Father with outstretched arms, like the figures in the mosaics of the catacombs, and with strong crying and tears pleading our cause in the presence of a reluctant God, but as a throned Priest-God, asking what he will of the Father who always grants his request. Our Lord's life in heaven is his prayer" (Swete, *Ascended Christ*, p. 95).

(5) *As a symbol of sovereignty and judgment.* In Matt. 25. 31 the "throne of glory" on which the Son of Man is said to sit is the throne of God and also the throne of Judgment. It is none other than the Judgment-seat of God (Rom. 14. 10) or of Christ (2 Cor. 5. 10). To Christ is committed the prerogative of divine kingship and judgment which belongs to God alone (John 5. 22). This judgment is an abiding fact of present experience (John 12. 31), and yet also is to be consummated in the future, in "the resurrection of judgment" (John 5. 29) "at the last Day" (John 6. 39, 40, 44, 54). Whereas the "Apostles' Creed" teaches that he will come *from* his throne to judge, the New Testament appears consistently to teach that he will execute judgment *while sitting upon* his throne. The difference is not unimportant. According to the New Testament the final judgment is in the eternal realm, not in the temporal. It is supernatural,

suprahistorical, heavenly judgment, to which Christ will summon "the living and the dead".

How are we to conceive the heavenly Session to-day? We no longer think of heaven as located above the sky, separated from us by an interval of distance. It is the eternal, non-spatial realm. For God is a spirit, and his habitation must be spiritual. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, because the Kingdom is not physical. Therefore all spatial terms such as "at the right hand" and "above" and "on high" are metaphorical and symbolical. We have considered the figurative character of the term "sitting". "At the right hand" is indicative of Christ's power and authority as the Father's vicegerent and representative. The idea of heaven as "above" and "on high", though no doubt understood literally by New Testament writers, is for us symbolic of exalted glory and holiness, of divine transcendence.

The Exalted Christ is not separated from us by space. He shares the divine omnipresence. Though transcendent, he is also immanent, ever with us in virtue of the mediating presence of the Holy Spirit in our hearts.[1] Just as our minds, being non-spatial, transcend our bodies and yet are immanent in them, so Christ, though he transcends both our minds and our bodies, abides in those who are his own. It is a Zwinglian heretical theory of the Ascension which interprets the Session in terms of spatial separation; for Zwingli (*Fidei Christianae Expositio*, commenting on Acts 1. 9–11) wrote: "*Hoc loco aperte habemus eum a discipulis adsumtum in coelum; abiit ergo et non est hic.*" "He has gone away, and he is not here." It is this denial of the fulfilment of our Lord's own promise "I am in the midst" (Matt. 18. 20) and "Lo! I am with you alway" (Matt. 28. 20) which underlies Zwingli's description of the bread and wine of the Eucharist as "*signa Christi absentis*".

We reject utterly such an interpretation of the Session.

Christ in his heavenly Session is not corporeally absent from us, but spiritually present with us. He transcends every limitation of space in his heavenly victory, sovereignty, peace, intercession, and judgment. He who is enthroned in heaven is enthroned also in the hearts of those who love, trust, and obey him.

A. W. Argyle.

Great Preachers—XVIII. Lancelot Andrewes

"Sept. 25th, Monday, about four o'clock in the morning died Lancelot Andrewes, the most worthy bishop of Winchester, the great light of the Christian world." In these words William Laud, in his diary,[2] records the passing of one of the great figures of the English church. To us the brightness of that "great light" may be a little dimmed as we notice the weaknesses and failings of his life. Nevertheless, as a scholar, as a bishop, as a man of God, and as a preacher, Andrewes still remains one of the great lights of the Christian world.

[1] Cf. Rom. 8. 9–11, 26–27.

[2] P. 84.

Andrewes' sermons were the most popular and admired of the time. What is even more interesting is that they were acceptable at the dissolute and pleasure-loving Court of King James. In 1623 John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton, the British Ambassador in Holland: "On Christmas Day, the Bishop of London's Sermon, probably for its length, displeased the King, and he grew so loud that the Bishop was obliged to end abruptly . . . he is at disadvantage by having to preach after the Bishop of Winchester [Andrewes], who, as Dean of the Chapel, preaches the morning sermons with great applause."[1] T. S. Eliot considers that "his sermons rank with the finest English prose of their time, any time".[2] There are ninety-six of them, and they were originally published in 1629 at the command of Charles I, with a dedication by Bishop Laud and Bishop Buckeridge. There are seventeen on the Nativity, three on the Passion, eighteen on the Resurrection, fifteen on the Holy Ghost, fourteen on repentance and fasting, eight in commemoration of the Gowrie Conspiracy, ten on November 5th, and eleven on various other public occasions. It is not certain whether what we have are the sermons as they were actually delivered or merely very full notes. "There came to our hands a world of sermon-notes", wrote Laud and Buckeridge in their Dedication; but it is not quite clear what they meant, for in the next paragraph they tell us that "as the Sermons were preached, so are they published".[3] Let us examine the characteristics of the sermons of the most celebrated preacher of his age. The illustrations are taken from the three sermons on the Passion preached before the Court on Good Friday 1597, 1604, and 1605, which deserve to be much better known. The second of these was admired by Bishop Horne as "the highest wrought discourse extant" on the Passion.[4]

Andrewes was much concerned at the state of preaching in the church of his day. When preaching the Latin Sermon at the opening of Convocation in 1593, he set forth "definite doctrinal teaching" as one of the primary needs of the Church of England. "The office of preaching has been degraded by abuse; ignorance, folly, and fanaticism have usurped the pulpit and turned the church into a very barber's shop."[5] He insisted that care must be taken in the preparation and choice of sermons and in the actual presentation of the material—an insistence which he laid upon himself, for his sermons are the best illustrations of the ideals with which he charged others. "Most of his solemn Sermons he was most careful of, and exact; I

[1] *Calendar of State Papers; Domestic*, 4 January 1623.

[2] *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928), p. 14.

[3] "Andrewes Sermons" in *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*. Vol. I, pp. xiii–xiv.

[4] Quoted in R. L. Ottley, *Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 140. The most recent life of Andrewes is Forence Higham's *Lancelot Andrewes* (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.), published since this article was written. This is an excellent and accurate biography for the "ordinary reader". Its best feature is the neatness with which the bishop's life is fitted into the general historical events of the time. The chapter on Andrewes as preacher is the least satisfactory of the book.

[5] Ottley, op. cit. p. 33.

daresay few of them but they passed his hand, and were thrice revised, before they were preached; . . . and he would be bold with himself and say, when he preached twice a day at St Giles', he prated once."[1] That he approached his task in the spirit of prayer is shown from the section of his *Preces Privatae* headed "Before Preaching", which apparently he had originally written in his Bible: "By praying for himself and for them he is going to address, let him be a bedesman or ever he be a teacher . . . before he put forth a speaking tongue, let him lift up to God a thirsty soul, that so he may give out what from him he hath drunk in, and empty out what he hath first replenished."[2]

Andrewes' style seems quaint to the modern reader, and is in line with the medieval tradition of sermon-making. This is shown in the structure of his sermons and in his skilful use of antithesis, assonance, etc. His theme is set forth in the text, usually taken from the Genevan Bible, though he always has the LXX version very much in mind. Then follows the exordium, the end of which is made much clearer in the earlier editions of his sermons. Presumably the traditional bidding-prayer would follow and then the sermon proper, usually in three divisions, but sometimes two.

Andrewes' preaching is thoroughly Scriptural, and he displays great ability in introducing texts from all parts of the Old and New Testaments and showing their connexion. There is an example of this in the exordium to the first sermon on the Passion, where he brings together Zech. 12. 10; Acts 8. 34; John 19. 37; Heb. 12. 2; John 3. 14; and Gal. 3. 1, and connects them and uses them to illustrate and advance his thesis.[3] He always takes a text. To the Genevan version he sometimes adds the Vulgate, though whether he does so or not, it is constantly in his mind. It is the Vulgate version of his text which he divides and subdivides, and so exhibits the word-play which is another of his links with medieval preaching. We should find his detailed method of handling a text somewhat trying. T. S. Eliot remarks that he takes each word and "derives the world from it; squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning which we should never have supposed any word to possess".[4] Mr Fraser Mitchell speaks of "his habit of letting off words like squibs, so that they break into a number of dazzling images".[5] In the Good Friday sermons there is no passage comparable with the "Immanuel" section of the 19th sermon on the Nativity,[6] but there are passages like the following: "Then is to follow the act or duty of looking on this sight, *ἀφορῶντες εἰς* 1. Wherein first the two prepositions, 1. *Ἀπὸ* and 2. *Εἰς*, 'from' and 'to': to look 'from', and to look 'to'. 2. Then the two verbs: 1. One in the verse expressed, that is, *ὁρᾷν* in *ἀφορῶντες*. 2. The other of necessity implied, for we have never a verb in all the verse. *Ἀφορῶντες* is a participle, and but

[1] Buckeridge in "Andrewes' Sermons", Vol. V, p. 295.
[2] *Preces Privatae* (Ed. Brightman), p. 257.
[3] "Sermons", Vol. II, pp. 119–21.
[4] Op. cit. p. 24.
[5] *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson*, p. 162.
[6] "Sermons", Vol. I, pp. 144 ff.

suspendeth the sentence, till we either look back to the verb before . . . or to the verse next after . . .".[1] Indeed, not even all his contemporaries liked it, as witness the Scottish lord who told King James that Andrewes "did play with his text as a jackanapes does, who takes up a thing and tosses and plays with it, and then takes another and plays a little with it. Here's a pretty thing and there's a pretty thing."[2]

But Andrewes rarely indulges in word-play for its own sake. He never loses sight either of his text or of his goal, and his method is always intended to further the subject towards its predestined end. It never results in evading the theme or mere playing to the gallery. As Canon Charles Smyth put it, "it is not . . . the play on words, but rather the play of thought upon the words, that gives to Andrewes' sermons their essential and distinctive quality".[3] He uses this method, moreover, to hammer home his points. "The pain of the body is but the body of pain: the very soul of sorrow and pain is the soul's sorrow and pain."[4] "If it be hard to endure, it must be more hard to endure hard things; and of all things hard to be endured, the hardest is death."[5]

Andrewes is master of the short pithy sentence. "Compassion is but passion at rebound."[6] "The Cross is but a little word, but of great contents."[7] Antithesis and assonance too have their place. "He sits now at ease That before hung in pain. Now on a throne, That before on the Cross. Now at God's right hand, That before at Satan's left."[8] "Men may drowsily hear it and coldly affect it, but principalities stand abashed at it."[9] "As is the Person, so is the Passion."[10] Andrewes makes full use of illustrations from Biblical, patristic, and other sources, and all are made to help on and enforce the central thought of the sermon. St Augustine, St Bernard, St Chrysostom, Leo, Theodoret, the Greek Liturgy, Aristotle, Livy, Juvenal, is a brief list of the non-Biblical references in the Good Friday sermons.

In these sermons there are some fine passages—fine for the quality of their prose and for the depth of their insight and devotion. One notices the use of the *Liber Charitas* theme, which was a traditional theme, whose origin is obscure, but which had been handled with great effect in a Good Friday sermon by John Fisher. Fisher had likened the crucified body of Christ to a book, and the wounds to capital letters in red.[11] Andrewes accordingly says, "The print of the nails in them, are as capital letters to record his love towards us. For Christ pierced on the cross is *liber charitas*, 'the very book of love' laid open before us."[12] And again, ". . . being spread and laid wide open on the Cross, he is *liber charitas*, wherein he that runneth may read. . . . Every stripe as a letter, every nail as a capital letter. His *livores* as black letters, his bleeding wounds as so many rubrics."[13] Among his other similes one finds the following: "His wounds they

[1] Vol. II, 161. [2] *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. O. L. Dick, p. 7.
[3] *Art of Preaching*, p. 129. [4] II, 144. [5] II, 167. [6] II, 123.
[7] II, 167. [8] II, 183. [9] II, 149. [10] II, 147.
[11] *The English Works of John Fisher* (E.E.T. Soc.), pp. 363–6.
[12] II, 132. [13] II, 180.

are as windows, through which we may well see all that is in him";[1] "His blessed body is as an anvil to be beaten upon";[2] and "They did not on Golgotha pierce his hands and feet, but made wide holes like that of a spade, as if they had been digging in some ditch".[3]

Many of Andrewes' sermons are acceptable as material for meditation. That this is so is probably because the sermons themselves are the fruit of Andrewes' own careful meditation. One can trace connexions between his sermons and his *Preces Privatae*—cp. the "Preces", pp. 90 and 214–18[4] with the thought and style of the Good Friday sermons. Indeed Dr Brightman has written, "The devotions are in fact an abstract of the sermons, and the sermons a developement and expansion of the devotions."[5]

The sermons, except those on the Gunpowder Plot and the Gowrie Conspiracy, which are the least pleasing of his works, are remarkably free from polemics and the exaggeration of differences and divisions. Moreover, he eschewed speculation about things in themselves unknowable. "For these sixteen years since I was ordained priest", he says, in his judgment on the Lambeth Articles, "I have never publically or privately disputed or preached on these mysteries of predestination."[6] When dealing with the deeper mysteries of the faith he displays a great reverence and restraint. "We shall lose ourselves, we shall be confounded to see in him all that may be showed us, the object is too great."[7] This is illustrated in his treatment of the Agony in the Garden and the Fourth Word from the Cross ("It cannot be expressed as it should, and as other things may; in silence we may admire it, but all our words will not reach it"[8]).

Andrewes considered it to be his aim to present the Christian truth as taught by the Church of England, and one of the excellences of his sermons is his comprehensive conception and presentation of the faith, due weight being given to all its parts and the connexion between the parts. It is the faith in its wholeness that he preached.

If Andrewes was the great preacher and model at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Tillotson had taken his place at the end of the century, and a comparison of the two lights up Andrewes' characteristics. As Dean Church wrote of him: "He is not a mere moralist, not simply a preacher of high duties and elevated views of human nature and prospects. He is first and foremost a theologian, whose deepest belief is the importance of his theology and who profoundly reverences its truth."[9] His aim is to instruct his hearers, to proclaim the great facts of the Christian religion, and to content himself with an earnest appeal to respond to those facts in faith and penitence.

Andrewes' style of preaching was not for lesser men to imitate. When they did, it usually descended into punning and word-playing for its own sake. Bishop Felton said, "I had almost marred my own natural trot by endeavouring to imitate his artificial ramble."[10] It was

[1] II, 178. [2] II, 143. [3] II, 170. [4] Ed. Brightman. [5] Op. cit. p. li.
[6] Quoted by Dean Church in *Masters in English Theology*, pp. 96–7.
[7] "Sermons", II, 163. [8] II, 147. [9] Op. cit. p. 96.
[10] Fuller's *Worthies*, II, p. 66.

for that reason that Andrewes' style went out of fashion. John Evelyn listened to a preacher on 15 July 1683 who used Andrewes' method —"full of logical divisions, in short and broken periods, and Latin sentences"—and commented that this method is "now quite out of fashion in the pulpit, which is grown into a far more profitable way, of plain and practical discourses".[1] Even George Herbert, a friend of Andrewes, says that the "way of crumbling a Text into small parts, as, the Person speaking, or spoken to, the subject, and object, and the like, hath neither in it of sweetness, nor gravity, nor variety, since the words apart are not Scripture, but a Dictionary".[2]

Nevertheless, although Andrewes' style and method are not to be imitated and are long out of date, it would not be amiss if the twentieth-century preacher adopted some of his principles and presuppositions. The first of these is the emphasis on Biblical and expository preaching—the taking of a text, even of a single word, and expounding it to the people—declaring the Word of God to men. It is still possible to hear preachers who seem almost unaware that the Scriptures exist, or who use their text merely as a peg upon which to hang a series of irrelevant platitudes. Then, next, a sense of the tremendous responsibility of the preaching office, to be approached in prayer, with meditation, and with much preparation. Thirdly, a grasp of the wholeness of the Christian faith and a conviction of the importance of theology. People are often offered stones instead of bread, "nice thoughts about God" instead of the full depths of the Gospel. Fourthly, the importance of logical and clear construction of the sermon, instead of a wandering hotch-potch of disconnected remarks. All these things, and many others, might well be imitated by our preachers, to their own and to their people's profit.

PAUL A. WELSBY.

Lightfoot, Savage and Eden—Sidelights on a Great Episcopate

THE chair on which I am sitting, in the Dean Savage Library in the Cathedral Close of Lichfield, bears a silver plate with the inscription: "Presented to the Reverend Canon Savage, when leaving the Diocese of Durham, by members of the Central Society for Sacred Study, deeply grateful for his helpfulness as Warden. July 1904". Facing me is a large book-case, inscribed: "S. Hilda 1891–1904". This was a gift from the parishioners of South Shields, made at the same time, when Bishop G. R. Eden had appointed Savage to the living of Halifax. A period of five years in the diocese of Wakefield preceded his move to the Midlands, where for thirty years (1909–39), he was Dean of Lichfield. Here *inter alia* this Library, which he founded and endowed, commemorates his work.

Henry Edwin Savage and George Rodney Eden entered the diocese of Durham in 1879 as personal chaplains to its newly appointed bishop, Joseph Barber Lightfoot. The devotion of the two younger

[1] *Diary* (Everyman Edition), II, 185. [2] *Priest to the Temple*, chap. vii.

men, the original members of the Auckland Brotherhood, to their great Cambridge teacher, not only lasted throughout their periods of service in the Durham diocese, but long survived Lightfoot's untimely death in 1889, and persisted throughout Eden's long episcopate at Dover and Wakefield, and Savage's distinguished tenure of the Lichfield deanery. The story of Lightfoot's episcopate belongs, of course, to history, in which it has its unshakable place. The purpose of this article is not to recapitulate or summarize what is well known, despite the lack of a full-scale biography, but only to withdraw from obscurity one or two otherwise quite unknown incidents in Lightfoot's career, rescued from a little bundle of papers accidentally preserved. In a cupboard in the Dean Savage Library I recently discovered a number of personal MSS, apparently unsorted after Dr Savage's death, containing correspondence between himself, Bishop Eden, and Dr J. O. F. Murray, sometime Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. The letters are all private and personal, but in view of the vivid sidelights which they throw on Lightfoot's character and the condition of the Church in a northern diocese nearly seventy years ago they are worth reading, for they bring out a few aspects of the great episcopate not covered by the composite volume *Lightfoot of Durham*.

On 10 December 1927 Murray wrote to Eden to say that he had been asked to contribute an article to *The Guardian* on "The Eucharistic Teaching of Lightfoot, Hort and Westcott". Murray promptly tackled this formidable subject, only to find himself hampered by what he called "the scantiness of the materials, especially in the case of Lightfoot".

"His commentaries and sermons are rather strangely silent. He grapples with the historical aspect, e.g. the date of the separation of the Eucharist and the Agape, and has a fine passage in Clement 3, Vol. I, on the original conception of the 'Gifts'. But in the sermons I can find only one direct appeal to the meaning of the Service, in the last of the Cuddesdon Addresses, given at the closing celebration of a retreat, and an indirect reference to Cosin's work in the Prayer Book in 'The Leaders of the Northern Church' " (*sic*).

Murray went on to inquire about possible information in Lightfoot's "Charges". Eden's method of replying to this was to send the letter to Savage, with a covering note which amply explains his own inability to give the matter any prolonged thought at that time—in the hectic interim between the two Revised Prayer Book Measures.

"Can you help Murray? I have told him to write to you—perhaps he may—and to the Dean of Wells.[1] It should be very carefully done. Just starting for Lambeth. This is a big moment, and I hope people will not lose their heads or their tempers."

Thus it was that on St Thomas's Day 1927 Dr Savage composed a detailed letter to Murray, which could not have been of much academic assistance, as it says but little about the literary sources to be explored. It is, however, quite a remarkable document, and it throws

[1] J. Armitage Robinson, who had been chaplain to Lightfoot at Auckland 1883–4.

a revealing light on the character and personality of Lightfoot (with whom the letter is almost entirely concerned).

The dean began by pointing out that on no more appropriate day could he sit down to write about his beloved master, "for to-day—St Thomas's Day—is the anniversary of Bishop Lightfoot's death, when he is more than ever in my remembrance. More than ever: for in all these thirty-eight years since his passing, I don't think there has been a single day (except in occasional intervals of illness) in which I have not remembered him in my intercessions."

In order to appreciate Lightfoot's eucharistic teaching, Savage explains, it is necessary to understand the condition of the diocese when he was consecrated Bishop of Durham.

"When Lightfoot became bishop, it is not too much to say that to a large proportion of the parochial clergy whom he found in office, the Holy Communion meant almost nothing. Watkins,[1] who was appointed Archdeacon of Northumberland in March 1880 (i.e. before the division of the diocese in 1882), took an early opportunity of making a thorough visitation of the archdeaconry. It covered the southern half of the county and at that time embraced ninety parishes. He found that in fourteen of these the Holy Communion was celebrated only three times a year. There was indeed a larger number in which there was a celebration on the first Sunday in each month, but in several of these instances there was no celebration at all on Easter Day, unless it happened to fall on the first Sunday. Matters were not quite so bad in the county of Durham: but the general attitude was much the same.

"Now, the bishop could not remove these inert incumbents from their freeholds. All he could do was gradually to leaven the diocese by importing men of a higher stamp. And so it was that he organized his family of young graduates at Auckland Castle, to be prepared there for ordination: a scheme which was bitterly resented by not a few of the old intransigents. And at the same time he attracted other young clergy from the south. But it required an almost infinite patience, thus gradually to mould the tone and the practice of the clergy at large."

It may be as well to interpolate here the reminder that this correspondence antedates the well-known composite memoir, *Lightfoot of Durham*, by nearly five years (*Lightfoot of Durham, Memoirs and Appreciations*. Collected and edited by G. R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald. Cambridge University Press, 1932). But nowhere in this book —nor anywhere else so far as I am aware—is there any trace that the scheme for the Auckland Brotherhood met with initial opposition from the older clergy, except in a paragraph in the now long defunct magazine *The Auckland Chronicle*, which was privately circulated to old members of the Brotherhood. No I of the magazine, dated March 1909, survives in the Dean Savage Library and contains an

[1] H. W. Watkins, Canon of Durham, and successively Archdeacon of Northumberland (1880–2) and of Auckland (1882–1914). For a typically Hensonian character sketch of this formidable personality in his old age see *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, I, 148–9.

article by Dr Savage entitled "Dr Lightfoot at Cambridge in 1879". (This is quoted—without acknowledgment of source—in Chap. 7 of *Lightfoot of Durham*, p. 77. There are also brief hints of dissatisfaction among the older incumbents with Lightfoot's apparent promotion of younger men on pp. 76–7, 81.)

Savage's letter to Murray proceeds: "You can understand therefore why it is that nothing is to be found in Lightfoot's published sermons and addresses that reveals any special view or interpretation of the Eucharist. He was plunged into a community in which the prevalent atmosphere was not merely aloofness from, but actual ignorance of, all sacramental teaching. And any stress laid upon Holy Communion, either in instruction or in greater frequency of celebration, was promptly stigmatized as a dangerous token of High Church tendencies. And if the bishop had pressed the subject in his public utterances, he would have been branded as a strong party man. So, with his immense caution and self-control, he bided his time, and proceeded carefully to prepare the ground.

"At the same time, he quietly and unostentatiously revealed his own attitude in respect of worship, by the reverent services in his own chapel, and, in his later days, by the type of worship in St Ignatius' Church at Sunderland which he built.[1]

"Bishop Lightfoot, in his Confirmation addresses, did press upon the candidates their right and their duty to attend Holy Communion, but not always with quite happy results. In 1883 one of my Pelton[2] candidates, a pit lad, had been unable through illness to come to the Confirmation. I therefore took him afterwards to be confirmed at another church, six miles away. The rector there was a new importation from Manchester; the living being in the Bishop of Manchester's gift. He had heard that the Bishop of Durham adopted the unprecedented course of urging those whom he confirmed to become communicants, and he accordingly laid his plans to gratify his lordship by an exceptional support of this new idea. So at the end of the service, which began at 11.30 a.m., he came forward to the chancel step and said, 'My lord, may I have your permission to give out a special notice?' Then, turning to the candidates, he announced 'My dear young friends, you have now been confirmed. I hope you will hurry home and get your dinners and then you will just have time to come right back and receive your first Communion at 3 o'clock.'

"So far as I can recollect, the bishop's instructions about Holy Communion—of course, very simple—treated it only as a means of grace, on the general lines of the Catechism.

"My impression is that his own view did not really go beyond that. At least I cannot recall ever hearing him speak about the sacrificial aspect. It may be—but I don't think it is the case—that to some extent my idea of Lightfoot's position with regard to the Eucharist

[1] Cf. *Lightfoot of Durham*, chap ix. "The Bishop's Thank-Offering, St Ignatius the Martyr, Sunderland."

[2] Savage was vicar of Pelton 1881–5. It does not require very detailed research to identify the parish church in which this incident occurred!

is tinged by reminiscences of Westcott's attitude. He (Bishop Westcott) always seemed to me to be quite unable even to understand what was meant by the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist: in fact, he appeared to have no conception of the principles of sacrificial worship: and that, to my mind, is what makes his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* so disappointing; though I heard him more than once refer to it as if he regarded it as being his best bit of work. (But I expect this will seem to you rank heresy to say this about Westcott. If so, please forgive me, and forget it.)

"I doubt whether it would be possible to get men of the present generation to understand, or to make allowances for, the general state of opinion and of practice about the Eucharist half a century ago. For example, Lightfoot all but always adopted the North end position in celebrating. (Only once did I see him take the Eastward position, and then he was obviously uncomfortable.) Tell that to a modern priest, and he would at once put the bishop down as an unmitigated Low Churchman. But he was very far from being that. The North end had always been the familiar position to him, and in Durham diocese as it was in the eighties the Eastward position was, at any rate in the earlier years, markedly suspect. Surely it was a token of the bishop's cautious tolerance that he refrained from infringing a prevalent if also ignorant prejudice in a matter which, after all, was not essential."

Apparently Savage wrote at the same time to Eden, giving him the gist of what he had told Murray. The letter is not extant, but a letter from Eden to Savage dated Christmas Day 1927, obviously a reply, reads as follows:

"I think you are quite right about Bishop Lightfoot. He firmly believed in Sacramental Grace. Witness his agonizing preparation of himself for his first Confirmations. There was nothing indefinite about his teaching about that *Χειροτονία*. But I never heard him speak of the sacrificial aspect. I remember (just when I had accepted Bishop Auckland in 1883) a talk with him in the park about the grace of Baptism, when my own mind was *μετέωρος* drawn towards F. D. Maurice, rejecting 'charitable assumption' as explaining Titus 3. 5, and the absolute language of the service of Baptism in the Prayer Book (*sic*), and of the Prayer in Confirmation—and yet unable to accept the almost *opus operatum* view, as it seemed to me, of Catholicism. I pressed him very hard, and plied him with these aspects. He was—*more suo*—silent. Then I stopped him as we were entering the gates, and adjured him, as one about to take up the charge of all these souls, to tell me what he really thought was the truth. With tears in his eyes, he put his hands on my shoulders and said, "My child, I do not know." He begged me not to be too sure of very clear-cut definitions. You know exactly what he would have said. It was like his remark at Bournemouth in his illness. "Things that edify others do not edify me: I feed upon four or five great ideas."[1]

[1] Cf. "He had little love of symbolism or elaborate forms in worship, but, like his great namesake Butler, had a reverent care for externals. In his last ill-

"There is a fine letter in Hort's Life and Letters which I should think expresses what Lightfoot would have said about baptismal regeneration. So far as I remember there is very little in Hort's letters about H.C.——."

It was, as is well known, Lightfoot's express wish that no biography of him should be written, and over forty years had to elapse before the composite memoir appeared. There is thus a gap in the history of the diocese, for the memoir, comprehensive as it is in some ways, did not claim to be a biography and only aimed to "preserve some knowledge of the personality of Lightfoot while yet there survive some of those who knew him intimately both at Durham and elsewhere". It is very doubtful now whether the gap will ever be filled, and so it seems there is room for these few mid-Victorian sketches, which add a little—even if only a very little—to the series of word pictures which survive of one whom Dean Lake well described as "one of the greatest prelates who ever held the see of Durham".

ROBERT WILSON.

Estrangement from Man

SIMONE WEIL will start us on our subject. She said many wise things. She saw connexions that others miss. She could put things in a way that makes the reader suddenly realize that *this* is what he has always believed. ("We do not need to search for [God], we only have to change the direction in which we are looking." "The danger is not lest the soul should doubt whether there is any bread, but lest, by a lie, it should persuade itself that it is not hungry.") The things in her writings, as in anyone's writings, that seem startlingly true or new are the things that we believed anyway but have never been able ourselves to express so well. She has said them for us; and now we really see what they mean. Her sudden, and deserved, reputation rests perhaps on the fact that she said in this clear way a very large number of things that a great many people believe.

But she seems from the accounts of her life to have been a strange woman: in her personal relations a sort of female Kierkegaard.

She would not trust herself to make real friendships. Friendships, she knew, were bound to come unstuck, and one would be left alone and unhappy; better to be alone all along. She went into social work, but kept the best part of herself back. She could write: "Every dream of friendship deserves to be broken. It is no accident that you [she is speaking of herself and to herself] have never been loved."

She thought much about herself. I do not mean that she was conceited, that she thought *highly* of herself. She thought herself, indeed, very unworthy. But she thought this about herself a lot; she had the self-centredness of a person over-impressed with his own smallness. "I am tired of talking to you about myself, for it is a

ness not a Sunday passed, even in exteme exhaustion, without his receiving Holy Communion. Yet speaking of other acts of worship he used those remarkable words over which I have often pondered. "Things that edify others do not edify me. I feed upon four or five great ideas." (*Lightfoot of Durham*, chap. 15, sermon by G. R. Eden at Cambridge, 24 November 1929.)

wretched subject," she says in a letter to her spiritual adviser, Father Perrin; yet she seems never really to tire of talking about herself, and the wretchedness of the subject makes it all the more absorbing to her. She asked for advice, yet distrusted it when she got it. And something like distrust is seen in her letter to Gustave Thibon: "I shall never forget the generosity which made you write such comforting words, which, even though one cannot believe them, warm the heart."

Much of her writing in its worried introvertedness has the look of certain pieces of French Existentialism, or of an English Existentialist book like *The Unquiet Grave*. Her paper on "The Love of God and Affliction" (in *Waiting on God*) reads in part like an Existentialist essay on *angoisse*.

Now, Simone Weil has been called a mystic, and mystics are often supposed to be people who withdraw from intercourse with their fellows in order to be able unimpeded to have intercourse with God. There is a certain sort of religious temperament that goes with a feeling of estrangement from man (and indeed of desire for it). There is also a religious temperament that is most conscious of estrangement from God; but Simone Weil seems not to have had that kind of temperament. This is not to say that she was *not* conscious of estrangement from God. She was certainly conscious of it. And surely *every* religious person is conscious of estrangement from God. But it is the feeling of estrangement from man that seems more strongly to mark Simone Weil's nature.

The feeling of estrangement from God and the feeling of estrangement from man sum up (in a very rough way) two sorts of religious temperament. They are temperaments that do not always combine well. Sometimes, of course, they do; but sometimes they do not. One man may be chiefly conscious of himself as sinner, of being as far from God as the ends of the world from each other. Another man may be chiefly conscious of himself as cut off from other men; he is the man with Existentialist worries, for whom each man is an island. These men *may* be the same man. But often they are not. On the other hand, there have been those in the history of Christianity who have felt estrangement from God, and have interpreted that as a reason for feeling estrangement from man: although, then, withdrawal from intercourse with their fellows, and a life of lonely meditation, have sometimes led in them to a lessening of the feeling of estrangement from God; so that all that is left is the feeling of estrangement from man.

But all these things are generalizations, and generalizations can usually have holes picked in them. And it does not really matter what may be the relation between the feeling of estrangement from God and the feeling of estrangement from man. What is important is that there should *be* such a thing as the feeling of estrangement from man, and that this should belong to some religious people.

It is hard to know what to say precisely in description of the feeling of estrangement from man. Perhaps it is a kind of religious fastidiousness. Perhaps it has something to do with the "holier than

thou" attitude; except that it would be thought to be more respectable than that. And certainly it would seem to be one of the things that make people think that the view is right that calls religion sublimated sex. (It is important to notice that the religion-is-sublimated-sex view is only one of several possible descriptions of the "facts". And it is also important to notice that a *description*, or at the most an *interpretation*, is all it is; it is not an *explanation* of anything, except in so far as a description or an interpretation may "explain" something. There may be a variety of motives for holding the view. One motive certainly is its *shocking* sound, which makes it appeal to persons who like to be thought daring. But an equally good description, which makes neither better nor worse sense of the "facts", is that sex is sublimated religion; those who fail to get what they want in religion find it in sex.)

Kierkegaard and Simone Weil have enriched Christian thought. Did they do so because of or in spite of their temperaments? Or was there no connexion between their temperaments and their religion? How many of the saints and leaders of the Church have felt estrangement from man?

Hearty, back-slapping extroverts are not *usually* the most distinguished Christians. Nor, perhaps, the normal and "well-adjusted". It is the introverts, the people who cannot get on with other people, the unsuccessful in love, the slightly warped, who have taken religion most seriously, and who have themselves been taken most seriously by the Church. No doubt there are as many ill-adjusted people outside the Church as in it (if, indeed, "ill-adjusted" is not altogether too strong a word to use here). Perhaps it is the "ill-adjusted" who do most to further *any* study or activity or way of life. Perhaps "the world's" standards are wrong, and it is the "well-adjusted" man who is odd. Who knows. . . ?

The feeling of estrangement from man is seen in an extreme form in Kierkegaard and, if I have not been unfair to her, in Simone Weil. (She *did* describe herself as "gregarious"; but so in a way was Kierkegaard gregarious: gregariousness, however, is not really what matters.) But in a less extreme form it is not uncommon. It seems one cannot have Christianity without it. But does it really belong to Christianity, or only to one of the sorts of people who become Christians? Is the connexion accidental, or is there something significant in the fact that a certain sort of person who tends to be interested in religion tends also to feel himself cut off from other men? (And, in the history of Christianity, an especially important sort of person.) And if there is something significant in the connexion does the significance lie in the fact that the connexion is a *causal* connexion, and if it is a causal connexion, what causes what?

Again, it is *right* to feel estrangement from God, but how far is it *right* to feel estrangement from man? Is this what Christ wanted his followers to feel?

Must we be rather unsuccessful in our personal relations before God can make much of us? I do not in the least know what the answer to this may be. I suspect that it is a "senseless" question, in

the philosophers' jargon; senseless, or unanswerable. But it does not do any real harm to ask unanswerable questions. It is the unanswerable questions that tend to keep on getting themselves asked. And it is in going on asking unanswerable questions that we come to learn how much, and how little, we know.

Perhaps those who feel estrangement from man have a picture of the world as being like a great plain covered with tents. Inside each tent is one person. Each person can see dimly through the thin walls of his tent the other tents all about him, and perhaps can see, even more dimly, something of the movements of the people in the tents nearest to his. He can shout to these near neighbours, and can (but in a muffled way) hear them shout back to him. But there is no way out of his tent, so that he cannot move closer to them; and even if he could he would be little better off, for there is no way *into* any of the other tents, so he would still be at a distance from his fellows. There is, however, a hole in the roof of all the tents. If each person looks upward and not outward he can see fairly clearly—though not *completely* clearly—the source of the *light* that fills his tent, which source he sees to be at a great distance from him; and he can in some sense "communicate with" the source of that light.

Those who feel estrangement from man are those who have learnt early to take this picture of the world for their own—this, or some picture like it. They have given up soon the hopeless task of trying to communicate horizontally with their fellows and have learnt to communicate vertically with God. The others, who have never discovered their condition, may spend a lifetime in the activity of communicating dimly through two thicknesses of tent wall, and never think of looking upwards; they are happy with what they have got, but what they have got is so little compared with what those who have learnt to look upwards have got.

No one can say that this picture of the world is either true or false; for the terms "true" and "false" hardly apply to world-pictures. To those who hold the picture it may seem self-evident; but the person who can stand off and look on the picture "objectively" can say that for those who *do* hold it it is "appealing" or "satisfactory", and for those who do not hold it it is not.

THOMAS MCPHERSON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Pittenger is Professor of Christian Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary, New York City, and the editorial representative of THEOLOGY in the U.S.A.

The Rev. A. W. Argyle is Tutor and Librarian of Regent's Park College, Oxford.

The Rev. P. A. Welsby is Rector of Copdock with Washbrook, near Ipswich.

The Rev. Robert Wilson is Dean's Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral and Librarian of the Dean Savage Library.

Mr McPherson is a Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy, University College, Bangor.

BOOK REVIEWS

VISION AND ACTION: THE PROBLEMS OF ECUMENISM. By L. A. Zander, translated from the Russian by Natalie Duddington, with an introduction by the Bishop of Chichester. Gollancz. 18s.

This is the first full treatment of the Ecumenical movement by an Orthodox churchman to be made available in English, and it is rightly welcomed by Dr Bell as a fascinating exposition from which Christians of all traditions will profit.

The presuppositions of ecumenism are carefully distinguished: *historically*, the fundamental division, not between Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, but between East and West, differentiated in language, epistemology (the East intuitive, the West discursive), and theology (the East had no Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas): *logically*, the coexistence of confessionalism, implying ecclesiastical exclusiveness, and of ecumenism as a God-given fact; *psychologically*, the paradox "I love heretics and see them as Christians"; *ethically*, the requirement "No proselytizing", which dogmatically implies "heretics can be saved" (Matt. 8. 11) but must not lead to compromise or relativism.

The problems of ecumenism centre in the Church—One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic: these attributes are treated with admirable fullness and insight. But behind them Prof. Zander notes the real crux—the "primary and irreducible intuition" of the Church: not wholly incommunicable (or ecumenism would be impossible), but transcending the analytic and discursive range of logical inquiry. The basis of ecumenism can be only a non-dogmatic "working hypothesis"—profession of the Name (Matt. 18. 20) and the will for κοινωνία.

Yet ecumenism is a divine reality: its real achievement is to recognize the presence of Christ in the prayers, sacraments, and doctrines of every church. This "contemplation with the eyes of love" is "unity without union", and has its own intrinsic value both in the endless process of life and as a foretaste of the world to come. Seeking Christ we find one another; vision and action are merged on the highest level.

Only an Orthodox theologian could have written this profound and glowing study, with its perfect balance of the logical and the mystical, the historical and the eschatological, the Christological and the pneumatological (a distinction Westerners often forget). Every page informs and stimulates—sometimes to questioning. He rejects the expedients of the "ecumenical minimum" and of "reintegration"; he also rejects the "branch theory" as implying relativism, but his own categories of "in-so-far-as" (40, 104, 131) and "churchiness" (130, 202) surely imply relativism themselves. In spite of his prescribed East-West division, he uses himself the threefold one throughout, even to finding on the Ecumenical Mount of Transfiguration "three tabernacles"—for Orthodox, Catholics, Protestants (217)! Is the new distinction any more than a tactical manoeuvre, designed to rank Orthodoxy with "the West in its totality" (60)? Liberal Protestants

would repudiate his descriptions of them (69, 140, 176) as caricatures, and Protestants in general would not always recognize themselves (103, 125, 152), nor care to be told that they "must understand" that in ecumenical prayer Orthodoxy "belittles itself" and makes "a sacrifice of love and condescension to their frailty" (155). His pages on faith are all Hebrews and no Paul—it is opposed to knowledge, not sight (128). His theology is in general Biblical, but not consistently: the exposition of Mariology (142) bears no relation to Scripture, which is the simple answer to his regretful complaint that Protestants reject the doctrine.

The book, however, is a fine example of the broadening perspectives which ecumenism is bringing to Orthodoxy. We might indeed ask whether the welcome recognition of the "unity that remains" (Name, Baptism, Destiny) could not have included the Bible and perhaps prayer (153 ff.). He is clear that simple reunion in the present aeon is an impossible dream, and rightly insists that our divisions are far other than merely sinful (86, 210). But his breadth of vision and understanding is itself an ecumenical triumph of the highest moment.

The book is well produced, with few printer's errors, but it badly needs an index.

B. Drewery.

Middlesbrough.

Saint Tikhon Zadonsky. By Nadejda Gorodetzky. S.P.C.K. 21s.

This new book by the author of *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Theology* is first of all a brief life, with the necessary background information, of a Russian bishop in the eighteenth century. St Tikhon came of humble stock, the son of a sexton, and worked his way up through the seminary, doing odd jobs in the vacations, with some help from an elder brother. He joined the monastic clergy at a moment when the community life of Russian monasteries was at a low ebb, and rose early to suffragan and then to diocesan episcopacy. He said too much to be convenient, like so many other Russian bishops since the reforms of Peter the Great, and in little more than four years retired on a pension, so that the last sixteen years of his life, on which much of his reputation as a spiritual guide rests, were spent as a retired bishop, generally over the gate of a small and not very inspiring monastery, though much time seems to have been spent in visits to a widening circle of friends.

In the second part of the book his spirituality and written works are discussed at almost equal length. The last thirty pages of the text are given to the growth of his veneration, his place in Russian literature and history, and the problem of his influence on Dostoevsky and of his relation to the Elder Zossima and to Alyosha in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Appendices consider among other historical points the canonization of saints in the Russian church. A set of notes on names amounts to a very brief but useful dictionary of Russian ecclesiastical biography in the eighteenth century.

The value of this book to the English reader is twofold. First it provides a clue to what is really the key period in the history of modern Russia, when the post-Petrine state and Russian society were falling further and further apart. English readers have seldom had a chance to see this schism from the conservative side, which in the long run was the revolutionary side. Secondly it provides an opportunity to see the development of a spirituality that in some respects seems decidedly modern rather than medieval, within institutions whose development had been arrested at the end of the medieval period. St Tikhon was apparently open to the influence of Arndt as well as of our own Bishop Joseph Hall. Dr Gorodetsky thinks that these Western influences have been exaggerated. His real master was St John Chrysostom. But it is significant that his works struck William Palmer of Magdalen as "remarkable for the almost total omission of everything that is ecclesiastical, so that their spiritual piety would seem to Protestants akin to their own, though they might not discover in them any positively Protestant statements".

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

THE REALM OF REDEMPTION. Studies in the Doctrine of the Nature of the Church in Contemporary Protestant Theology. By J. Robert Nelson. Epworth Press. 15s.

As Dr Nelson points out in his preface, one of the most urgent questions for Christians to-day is: What is the Church? It is bound to arise sooner or later whenever Christian unity is under discussion. Dr Nelson does not attempt to give a complete answer to the question. What he does do is to collect and present in an admirably clear way the main answers that have been given by theologians of the various traditions represented on the World Council of Churches. His book is the result of long research, mostly in this country and at Zürich under Dr Brunner, who contributes a foreword. It should help to dispel many illusions, both among those who magnify the differences between Christians and among those who belittle them. Dr Nelson traces the recovery in recent years of the idea of *koinonia* as the work of the Holy Spirit, and the growth of a less individualistic understanding of Christianity. "Historic Protestantism," he says, "so much as it speaks the minds of the reformers, is not the champion of individual religion, but even more community-minded than Roman Catholicism." As we should expect, one of the most difficult parts of the book is that dealing with "The Sacraments and the Ministry". The views examined range from those of the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* to that of Brunner, who regards the Christian minister as "the believing Christian who has the advantage over the others of a thorough theological training", and nothing more. Discussions of Christian unity in this country tend to centre on the question of the apostolic succession, and it is good for us to be reminded that "for the many Protestants who live in areas where neither the Orthodox

nor the Anglican Churches have much influence, this is a remote and somewhat unreal problem". It is also good for us to be reminded, as Dr Nelson does again and again, that the same word may be used by Christians of different traditions with entirely different meanings. For instance, when non-episcopal bodies say that they are ready, in the modern jargon, to "take episcopacy into their system", it is doubtful whether they always mean by episcopacy what Anglicans mean. By drawing our attention to some of these difficulties and dangers, as well as to the underlying agreements of Christians, Dr Nelson has done a real service to the cause of Christian unity.

W. D. Maundrell.

Sparsholt, Winchester.

The Christian Task in Independent India. By A. J. Appasamy. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

It is in a way a pity that Bishop Appasamy's book, which was completed in 1949, should have appeared only at the end of 1951. Had it been published in 1949 it would have been useful and timely. The author is one of the best scholars in the Indian Church; in 1950 he was consecrated Bishop in Coimbatore in the Church of South India. What he gives us in this book is a review of the attitude towards Christianity adopted by some of the leaders in Indian politics. He also reviews the problems and opportunities which face the Christian community in India, and sketches the careers of some leading Indian Christians, especially politicians. Dr Appasamy has interviewed most of the people of whom he writes; his standpoint could be described as that of the orthodox enlightened Congressman. He is entirely sympathetic with the Congress point of view, but is not so antagonistic to the influence of the foreigner as not to appreciate the difficulties of the Indian Church in finding adequate Indian leadership. In these circumstances it is very natural that he should be sanguine and soberly optimistic about the future of the Church in India.

But all the same, read in the changed circumstances of 1952, the book seems to suffer from a lack of realism. How delightful it would be, one finds oneself saying as one reads it, if only the leaders of the Congress Party of whom he writes could remain in office and could inspire their subordinates with their own admirable spirit of enlightened service! But unfortunately Gandhiji is dead, there is only one Pandit Nehru, and corruption and incompetence in the provincial and local administrations are already provoking a marked swing to the left in Indian politics. It is perhaps in his evaluation of Communism that Bishop Appasamy's book is most deficient. Communism is mentioned as a challenge once; and on page 20 Dr Matthai is quoted with approval as suggesting that there may perhaps be Christian Communists. But nowhere is the possibility of a Communist or near-Communist India really envisaged, and consequently nowhere is it suggested how the Christian church in India is to face a situation where its sole task may be the effort to survive.

Perhaps, however, the paper shortage in England may be more to blame for this than the author; and perhaps we may look forward to another book in which an up-to-date review is made, this time enriched by the experience of presiding over a busy and varied diocese.

ANTHONY HANSON.

DORNAKAL, S. INDIA.

JOHN WHO SAW. By A. H. N. Green-Armytage. Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.

Within the last twenty-five years some of the main stumbling-blocks to the acceptance of the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel have been removed. It is generally agreed that the evidence for the early martydom of John the Apostle is slight. The identification of the "witness" and the "disciple whom Jesus loved" with the Apostle John is for the most part accepted. And the certificate of authorship in John 21. 24 can no longer be regarded as a late forgery. It is not surprising, therefore, that a book should be published which seeks to demonstrate that John the son of Zebedee wrote the Fourth Gospel. Mr Green-Armytage feels that it is a matter of importance that we should know who the author was. He argues that "we cannot enjoy nor even understand the work of the fourth evangelist unless we have reached firm conclusions about his identity". He feels that the time is ripe to make some judgment upon the researches and opinions of the experts. He therefore assumes the role of juryman who, having listened to the speeches of learned counsel on each side and the witnesses they summon, now believes that he is in a position to pronounce the verdict. This he does in no uncertain way. He accepts the apostolic authorship not only of the Fourth Gospel but also of all the five Johannine books in the New Testament. He covers the well-worn ground of the external and internal evidence, the existence of the Elder John, the relation of the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptic Gospels and dislocations. He writes in a breezy style and the book is intended for those who are not experts in Biblical criticism.

The problem is, however, much more complex than this book suggests. The author makes no real attempt to meet the difficulty of how a Galilaean fisherman could write a book possessing the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel. Perhaps if he had examined in more detail the religious and philosophical affinities in the chapter on General Characteristics, the complex nature of the Fourth Gospel would have been more apparent. It is clear that this Gospel was written in a different mental atmosphere from the Synoptic Gospels. For example, Odeberg and Schlatter have argued that the polemical discourses of Jesus reveal a knowledge of contemporary Rabbinic theology. Yet the Apostle John was not a man who had been trained in the Jewish schools (Acts 4. 13). Mr Green-Armytage does not consider this possibility nor does he show any acquaintance with the works of these scholars, and it is surely the duty of a juryman to weigh carefully all the available evidence. In spite, therefore, of the

vigour and confidence with which this book is written we feel constrained to say that the verdict is still an open one.

HORSFORTH. E. KENNETH LEE.

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE. A Study of the Eucharist in the Life of the Christian Church. By W. Norman Pittenger. Oxford University Press, New York. 21s.

The blurb announces that this book is "written especially for laymen". No doubt American laymen will be better able to afford it than British, but of both it will demand a great deal more theological knowledge and interest than most Anglican clergy could be sure of in their laity. It is written from a very definitely catholic point of view, and often there is special pleading rather than a straight answer to protestant difficulties and objections. For instance, the writer does not attempt to expound the epistle to the Hebrews, but simply asserts that "it is only a prejudiced critic who can rule out of this document all trace of sacerdotal and sacrificial worship". Virtualism and Receptionism are mentioned only to be at once dismissed without further discussion.

The least satisfactory chapters are those on the New Testament and the Early Church, and the most useful are those which discuss the Eucharist as Action, Sacrifice, Communion, Presence. These set forth the catholic tradition at its best and not uncritically. The writer does not hide his dislike for "the way in which the degraded piety of much post-Tridentine Romanism has been taken over by some Anglican leaders and made by them a model and pattern for the Catholicism which the Anglican Communion maintains", and he adds that "there is nothing to be said, to-day, for persisting in this error, especially when our Roman brethren themselves, in the throes of self-examination and self-accusation, are mending their ways". There are, however, some unnecessarily scathing gibes at the evangelical practice of evening communion on Maundy Thursday, "an egregious and silly error" due to a "weakened and sentimentalized theology". His criticism is not only unfair and exaggerated, but quite misses the point.

Dr Pittenger allows his doctrinal conclusions to be controlled less by New Testament theology than by ecclesiastical tradition, and argues that "the differences to be observed in later periods are not those that come from a departure from the early witness, but those that involve a deeper penetration into the significance of that witness". In this case where does one stop? Thus one is not quite sure what is meant by the Western Church on being told that the theory of concomitance is "now standard doctrine" with it.

The importance of the sermon in the Eucharist is rightly stressed, but there is no attempt to relate the theology of the Eucharist to the theology of the Word or the Holy Spirit. There is no index and no references to the occasional quotations from other writers. It is surprising to be told on p. 135 that the fruits of the Spirit passage comes in Philippians.

DOUGLAS WEBSTER.
LONDON COLLEGE OF DIVINITY.

SHORTER NOTICES

Les Anges et Leur Mission. By Jean Daniélou. Editions de Chevetogne. 350 frs.

It is difficult to read this admirably learned and lucid summary of the patristic doctrine of angels without again marvelling at their burning reality for early Christians, as well as their many-sided activities and cosmic splendour. Certainly nothing could be further removed from the mind of modern pseudo-scientific man, who chooses to think himself permanently lost, without a Shepherd to find him or a Flock to return to, a solitary close-shorn lamb shivering in the wilderness of his multi-dimensioned—yet miserably one-dimensioned—universe. The Fathers saw man on earth as the straying hundredth sheep, and the world above him as the fold of the ninety and nine who have not strayed. Human life was a drama enacted before an intensely interested audience of supra-human life, and joined to it at every point; now it occurs by accident in the midst of various other crumplings in the space-time continuum. Then man, black sheep though he was, still belonged to the immense family in heaven and earth; now he is the orphan of the cosmos—or rather, he would be, if there were a cosmos. There remains the question whether we shall ever recapture anything like the power and vividness of the Fathers' vision by insisting on their doctrines, as Père Daniélou does here, while discounting those of our own physicists and psychologists. Surely the new model of the universe is, in its own way, as much a God-given revelation as the old—and one which, seeing that it is a revelation *to us*, may not be lightly set aside. And surely it is not a question of *either* the angelic world *or* the scientific, but of discovering in what manner they are, in fact, complementary. It is true that natural philosophy will, as Keats observed, clip an angel's wings; but they were, after all, appendages that needed amputation. On the other hand, the rumour that the operation has been fatal is much exaggerated. This inspiring book is one more sign that the patient is coming round.

D. E. Harding.

Ipswich.

The Founders of Clewer. The Centenary Book of St John Baptist Clewer. With a foreword by the Bishop of Oxford. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

Every priest of our Church and many layfolk should read carefully this little book. It is a fascinating record of the ideals that inspired the zeal and devotion of the first Warden and Mother Superior, Thomas Thellusson Carter and Harriet Monsell, of the Community of St John Baptist Clewer keeping its centenary this year. The debt owed by us all to the religious communities since the Tractarian Revival is immense, and the more their work is known among us the greater chance there will be of fostering vocations to the Religious

Life. Mother Harriet's Ideal of a Religious is so inspiring that it must be given in full:

The one great Aim of her life is the Glory of God.
The one great Example of her life is the Incarnate God.
The one great Devotion of her life is the Will of God.
The one great Longing of her life is union with God.
The one great Reward of her life is the Vision of God.

R. D. Middleton.

Oxford.

A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. By F. Goldie. S.P.C.K. 14s. 6d.

There is great need, as the recently retired Primus of the Scottish Church points out in his foreword to this book, for the removal of the widespread ignorance which exists, even amongst well-disposed Anglicans, with regard to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Grub's conscientious and erudite work in four volumes is not easy reading, nor is it widely accessible; and even Stephen's very readable two-volume history is far less widely known than it ought to be. Mr Goldie's book does not challenge comparison with either of these major works; it is frankly a short history, and much compression has been necessary. But it brings the story up to date, and its author is very well qualified for his task, both intellectually and pastorally; he is no mere compiler or "abbreviator", but has made extensive and effective use of the original documents. He also writes in an objective way, without recrimination or facile partisanship. Apart from the slight, though curious, lapse by which he describes the great Marquis as "Duke" of Montrose, his presentation of the tangled history of this period, from 1660 to the present day, is reliable and lucid, and should do much to enlighten the general reader who desires information rather than excitement. For it must be confessed that the story of Scottish Episcopalianism as here set forth lacks the thrill of Dr Mitchell's equally short work, *Scotland's Church*.

In another, and very practical, way Dr Mitchell's book has the advantage, though this is no fault of Mr Goldie's. The format of Mr Goldie's book is far superior, and it has four interesting illustrations; but it costs 14s. 6d., while *Scotland's Church* was obtainable a few years ago for 2s. Now, alas, it is out of print. It is impossible not to fear that the cost of the newer book will drastically limit its circulation; and even in these days 14s. 6d. seems a high price for so slim a volume. One can only hope that its solid merits will prevail over this formidable economic handicap.

✠Eric Brechin:

Broughty Ferry.

The New Eve. By J. H. Newman. Newman Bookshop, Oxford. 3s.

It is a most unbearable practice of publishers to produce books under the name of any famous writer, as new and till now unknown

works, which are in fact only compilations. The offence is worse still when the alleged author is for nothing in the arrangement of the materials; but it is worst of all to impose on that caricature of a book some piquant title which would have been utterly repulsive to the man whose name is so used and abused. However, when you come to read the book itself, you may find unsuspected niceties which bring the performance to an acme of perfection. Such is the case when the editor tells you quietly that he has judged whole paragraphs in his compilation insufficiently adapted to his purpose, so that he has not scrupled to re-write them in his own way. Then, finally, he crowns that stupendous achievement by explaining that the poor old great man with all this brushing up still makes a rather poor figure to the modern and enlightened reader, and politely washes his hands for that.

All these features are happily combined in the above-mentioned book.

Collège Libre de Juilly. L. Bouyer.

The Beginning and the End. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles. 25s.

The author believes that a genuinely Christian philosophy is impossible as long as men are bound by Aristotelian categories of thought. This book is an attempt to set out his own personalist philosophy, in which the subject and not the object is the basic category. The fundamental difficulty of this task lies in the fact that our language and our ordinary categories of thought are designed to deal with the object world. They are utterly unsuited to describing the mysterious qualities of that noumenal or spiritual world which is for Berdyaev the ultimate reality. As a result Berdyaev is continually struggling to express the inexpressible. How far does he succeed? At times it must be confessed that he seems to give justification to the claim that all metaphysics are necessarily meaningless. One can imagine the logical positivists chuckling over a "non-being" that "is both lower than being and higher than being", which "does not exist, but has an existential significance" (p. 143). Indeed, we can chuckle with them. But the fact that our language is so ill-adapted to describing the noumenal world does not of course disprove its existence. The great value of this book lies in its insistence on the reality of a noumenal world, which unlike Plato's is personal not universal in character. As Berdyaev rightly claims, that is the essential basis of a truly Christian philosophy.

The subject matter of the book is difficult, and it is not made easier by Berdyaev's method of writing. "It is not so much that I arrive at truth", he says in the preface, "as that I start from it". The book thus contains no clear argument from premises to conclusion. Rather he reinterprets some of the traditional problems of philosophy in the light of his own existential or eschatological thought. Problems of epistemology and ontology, of nominalism and realism, of evil and free-will, of evolution and history, of society and sex, are

all dealt with in this way. In all of them the solution to the traditional problems is found in an escape from objectification. There is much that is refreshingly stimulating in this new approach to old problems, though his solutions are not all equally convincing.

The most perfect production of the creative genius, says Berdyaev, being an embodiment in the objective world, always falls short of the initial creative act. So it is with this book. Despite the vigour and intensity of its writing, one feels that it does not convey the fullness of the author's vision. On his own hypothesis, it could not do so. But the vision is most certainly there, for those who will penetrate the difficulty of the medium.

MAURICE WILES.

THE CHURCH IN THE CHRISTIAN ROMAN EMPIRE, Vol. II. By J. R. Palanque and P. De Labriolle. Translated by Ernest C. Messenger. Burns Oates. 25s.

Regret that the late Dr Messenger has not lived to continue the work of translating the Fliche and Martin histories must be tempered with thankfulness that he was able to complete this volume before he died. It concludes Vol. III of the French edition, and it deals with the internal life of the Church in the fourth century, growing vigorous and self-assured beneath the turmoil of political activity described in the previous volume. A long section on monastic origins ends with a valuable study of the place of monachism in public opinion, both Christian and pagan. Christian morality, spirituality and culture in the century are examined, and the expansion of the Church into Persia, Armenia, Abyssinia, and among the Goths is traced as clearly as the scanty evidence allows. The last chapter describes the final stages of the revolution in which the State became patron of the Church instead of persecutor. The accounts are necessarily summary rather than discursive; long arguments are epitomized and conclusions are admirably concise, with full bibliographies for further study. We may hope that the publishers will be as fortunate in their choice of a translator to conclude the work as they were in engaging Dr Messenger in its beginning.

SUTTON COURTNEY. G. R. DUNSTAN.

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF ABBOT VONIER. Volume I: The Incarnation and Redemption. Burns Oates. 25s.

Most of the late Abbot of Buckfast's books have been out of print for some time, and this volume is the first of three which are planned by the publishers to include his most important works. In addition to a brief biographical foreword by the present Abbot, it contains four of Dom Vonier's books, *The Christian Mind*, *The Personality of Christ*, *The Victory of Christ*, and, much slighter, *The Divine Motherhood*. They are all admirably Biblical studies, of which the first is perhaps the most valuable. Its theme is Christ as the life of men, Christ not simply as giving life but as being life. At one time,

he tells us, he was intending to call it *The Christ of St Paul*, and it is full of long quotations from his Epistles. The chapter on Purgatory gently corrects much popular teaching: we should "apply to every dead Christian the beautiful expression that 'he fell asleep in the Lord' ". "The suffering of Purgatory is not one of the terrors of the dying Christian."

The Personality of Christ is more severely theological, and expounds St Thomas Aquinas with clarity. In order to account for the sorrow and suffering in our Lord's life he, following St Thomas, has to postulate a psychological miracle, whereby the Father prevented the higher graces in the soul of Christ from making themselves felt according to their full possibilities.

There are some particularly telling quotations from the sermons of St Leo. The author is aware that his readers may be astonished by this quotation from St Thomas: "Christ is the total wealth of the Church; he with the other elect is not greater than he himself alone."

The book is well but not impeccably printed; *χτίσμα* and *χτίσις* come repeatedly; other misprints are *enrrgy* (p. ix), *anti-nominian* (p. 79), *respecias* (p. 311).

KENNETH N. ROSS.

LONDON.

HERE I STAND. By Roland H. Bainton. Hodder and Stoughton. 20s.

It is doubtful whether Luther ever spoke the famous words "Here I stand, I can do no other." But if he did not, he ought to have done; and indeed, if he did not utter them with his mouth, he declared them by the course of his life. Properly taken in the context of obedience and allegiance to Jesus Christ and his Gospel, this saying sums up, better than perhaps anything else, his life and his significance in the history of the Church. They form an apt title for this life of Luther.

Professor Bainton of Yale Divinity School has taken advantage of the great increases in the knowledge of Luther's life and the understanding of his theology to write a straightforward biography. He does not investigate nor seek to prove anything, but simply relates the story, explaining its significance, and unfolding, in the relevant places, his thought. But let it not be supposed this is an unscholarly or even only a "popular" work. On the contrary, it is well documented, and clearly springs from a vast amount of research.

Professor Bainton knows a very great deal about Luther. And what is more, he has so presented him that the man walks out of the pages alive. Dr Bainton achieves this (which is biography's triumph) by really admirable art; partly the art of clear and vivid writing, and partly the skilful use of a large number of contemporary illustrations.

It is impossible not to feel affection for this man Luther. Exasperating often, and pig-headed, sometimes unpleasantly coarse; yet always his humanity is patent, his deep feeling for his family and his

friends, his kindness even to his old opponent Tetzel, his capacity for laughing at himself as well as at his enemies. Dr Bainton can afford to draw him complete, warts and all, for Luther, like Samuel Johnson, is a big and good enough figure to carry (humanly speaking) his faults.

But affection cannot be the final verdict with Luther, any more than can aversion. He wrote of the Roman Church: "Not until I am gone will they feel Luther's full weight" (quoted p. 373). This is also true generally. The impact of his theology can make itself felt only when we no longer shelter from it behind affection or aversion, but place it under the criticism of the Scriptures and let it speak to us and teach us from there. (Cf. Barth's advice to Marxians and Barthians: "take flight from the two Karls".) And this, in the last resort, is the Luther portrayed by Dr Bainton—the self-denying witness to the Word of God.

T. H. L. Parker.

Brothertoft Vicarage,
Boston.

The Infallibility of the Church. By G. D. Salmon. John Murray. 10s. 6d.

"Newman opposed to Salmon is no better than a protesting female under cross-examination by a first-class barrister." Such was Bishop Hensley Henson's retrospect of this book, and a fair-minded reader will endorse his further comment that it is not only a *tour de force* as a polemical essay, but also a completely annihilating criticism of the Roman claims. (The only serious attempt at a reply is buried in the obscurity of *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*.) The late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, concerned himself with one main point, for "it has now become more clear than ever that the whole Roman Catholic controversy turns on the decision of this one point—the Infallibility of the Church". He points out that it is over this issue that there are "perversions" to Rome. The doctrine is first examined *a priori* on philosophical grounds, and later *a posteriori* in the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the development of the Church.

It is nearly forty years since the last edition of this remarkable book, and Professor Woodhouse has skilfully abridged it. In the space of half the original he has omitted parts of six out of twenty-three chapters and the whole of only six others. But there are few footnotes and no appendix. This abridgment is a sign of the times, and although the resulting volume of 250 pages is good value to-day, we miss the immense erudition of this intellectual giant. But half a Salmon is better than no Salmon.

Much water has flowed down the Liffey and the Tiber since 1886. One trembles to think what Dr Salmon would have written on the findings of the Biblical Commission and the recent Roman Definition. On the other hand, many Anglicans to-day would wish to phrase differently his remarks on Scripture and Tradition, and would hold a somewhat different view of Biblical revelation. Likewise, the conclusions of literary and form criticism affect his argument but do not invalidate it. These lectures have worn remarkably well.

This book will always be a "classic" for anyone who has the courage to face facts, as Bishop Walter Carey points out in a characteristic preface, which does however contain one unfortunate inaccuracy. But this publication is specially timely. Rome's tragic rejection of the Ecumenical Movement is one of the challenges of our day, and it has yet openly to be faced and met.

HUGH MONTEFIORE.

WESTCOTT HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF GOD. By Nels. F. S. Ferré. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

THE MODERN RIVAL OF CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Georgia Harkness. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $2.75.

GOD AT WORK. By James Parkes. Putnam. 10s. 6d.

The Christian Understanding of God is a work of wide scope. The author, who holds a chair in the Vanderbilt University School of Religion, U.S.A., covers all the main topics which require treatment by a Christian thinker attempting to construct a philosophical theology. Section I is devoted to the Nature of God and Section II to the work of God in Creation, Incarnation, and Last Things.

Professor Ferré's central thesis seems to be that in metaphysical speculation, no less than in practical living, we should take seriously the affirmation God is love. He selects divine love, in preference to abstract being, as his *point de départ*. This selection, whether acceptable in itself or not, leads to some strange statements. Because God, as love, yearns for the object of his creative act, he is to be regarded as both actual and potential; and it is even correct to speak of becoming as intrinsic to his existence. How such statements can cohere with the traditional language employed elsewhere about God's self-sufficient nature is not at all clear. The author's logic is open to a query. Love, as De Burgh urged with ample support from Aquinas, may be the closest point of contact between God and man. Nevertheless a distinction must be observed between God's love and man's. To say, without qualification, that "to love is to be by becoming" (p. 26) is to assume gratuitously that God and man are characterized by a property in the same way. Love, like being, can be attributed to God only by analogy, and the treatment of analogy on pp. 68–70 is quite inadequate.

There are other subsidiary assertions which will appear questionable. Perhaps "there are no incorrigible sinners" (p. 229), and beyond death discipline and purification may issue in the salvation of every soul. Moreover, universalism may be compatible with the reality of human freedom. But such problems demand more detailed argument and less dogmatic assertion than Professor Ferré provides. Opponents of universalism will hardly be disarmed by pp. 226–8, where God's justice is exhibited as inferior to his love. For justice surely is as constant a factor as love in all that God is and does, if by justice is understood not an inflexible system of retribution, but (with St Paul) the final vindication of the moral order through sacrificial mercy.

The above criticisms are not meant to suggest that the book contains no theological insight or spiritual discernment. Throughout e.g. we are reminded that our life *in via* is a relentless preparation for our life *in gloria*; and more than one eloquent protest is uttered against a sentimental view of God's love. Also there is a right insistence upon the unity of God's action at every level. These and kindred truths might have been enforced with greater illumination if they had been expounded more patiently in a simpler and less rhetorical style.

The content of *The Modern Rival of Christian Faith* is indicated by the sub-title: An Analysis of Secularism. Dr Harkness surveys those phenomena which constitute a threat to Christian values; she attempts to assess their significance and to show how each fails when scrutinized in the light of the Gospel. In this way attention is paid to Humanism, Racism, Capitalism, and Communism. Other aspects of contemporary Secularism are noted which cannot be subsumed under these heads; such aspects may, however, be correlated with the vast increase in technological dexterity that typifies the twentieth century.

In the course of her comprehensive examination of Secularism (defined as "the ordering and conducting of life as if God did not exist") Dr Harkness offers many positive and helpful comments upon the nature of Christian discipleship in the present age. Chapters 13 and 14, for instance, deal with two particularly pressing and sometimes neglected topics: the need to apply the concept of vocation to all the varieties of work in which a Christian may be dutifully engaged, and the function of prayer in a world where barriers can often be crossed only in the spirit—by intercession.

Dr Harkness writes with obvious sincerity and a real desire to be fair. Her material is neatly marshalled and lucidly interpreted; each paragraph runs smoothly. When necessary, she does not fear to censure the attitude of her fellow-Christians in the U.S.A., markedly in the matter of racial exclusiveness. On some points, e.g. modern methods of total warfare, a more concrete decision would have been welcome; the mere citation of ecclesiastical documents is a little disappointing. Nevertheless this is a wise, courageous, and readable book.

God at Work is an endeavour to describe the revelation of God the Trinity in three stages: the Law delivered to Moses, the personal encounter in Christ, and the discoveries granted to scientists in Europe after the Renaissance. In his claim that the first and third, as well as the second, of these stages are relevant to the Christian, Dr Parkes commands assent; and in his specific suggestion that we can learn from post-Biblical Judaism he merits a hearing.

United Theological College,
Aberystwyth. H. P. Owen.

The Exploration of the Inner World. By Anton T. Boisen. Harper and Brothers, New York. $4.

Certain eminent American reviewers made some high claims for

this book on its first appearance in 1936, one even stating that it was the most important contribution in its field since William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, a work with which it has certain affinities of subject matter, but not, alas! of style or method. Its title is misleading, for it provides a very poor guide to the topography and customs of that inner world which even the least introspective of us know vaguely we have within or below. In fact, it is a sincere attempt on the part of the author to interpret a severe mental disturbance, which he himself experienced in early life, and to use it as a basis for coming to certain conclusions on such weighty subjects as "the foundations of spiritual healing", "the respective tasks of the priest and the physician", "the inter-relationship of individual and social salvation", and several others.

When the author is dealing with his own experiences he is both convincing and thought-provoking. His thesis that experiences such as his are "essentially problem-solving experiences" and purposive in character is one which is widely accepted amongst psychiatrists and could profitably be adopted by the clergy and others who come in contact with mental dysfunction, whether severe or not. But on the wider issues he is disappointing, his statistical methods are unconvincing, and the conclusions he draws from them are presented in a repetitive and rambling manner. His comments on the psychology of the religious life and on the various psychological schools often strike a superficial note. Professional colleagues who are called to a pastoral ministry amongst the insane may find matter of interest to them in the book, but it is a little difficult to understand why, when so much has been written on the subject since its first publication, it was thought worth reissuing without any alteration at all.

MORTIMER. R. E. WATERFIELD.

MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY. By Frederick Copleston, S.J. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

Father Frederick Copleston, S.J., Professor of the History of Philosophy, Heythrop College, takes the coronation of Charlemagne (A.D. 800) as a real, convenient, and not especially arbitrary starting-point for his summary of Medieval Philosophy which forms the content of this little book. He begins with a rapid flash-back to the systems from which Medieval Philosophy took its origin and names Augustine, Pseudo-Dionysius, and Boëthius as the men through whom Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism passed to the medieval philosophers. He surveys the work of the Palatine School, summarizes the contribution of Erigena, and outlines, as satisfactorily as one could in so short a space, the problem of Universals, and then proceeds to show how the application of dialectic to theology in the hands of Anselm and Peter Abelard and the compiling by the unimaginative Lombard of his "Sentences" laid the foundations of the forthcoming Summae. Before passing on to Aquinas, he finds time for two brief chapters on the Arabian philosophers and the medieval universities.

In dealing with Aquinas Father Copleston bids fair to have achieved the impossible—reduced him to sixteen pages! He rightly treats of Duns Scotus as one of the most able and acute philosophers whom Britain has produced. As the fourteenth century witnessed both the consolidation of the great systems of the previous century and the beginning of a break-up of medieval philosophy with the advent of William of Ockham and the movement that followed his thinking, Father Copleston devotes, quite rightly, two chapters to this century and then closes the book with a brief description of what the mystics taught and a summary of medieval political theory.

The book is able, concise, and easy to read. Father Copleston apparently does not share the opinion of some philosophers that they would lose caste by being intelligible. Whether the book would serve as a suitable introduction to Medieval Philosophy for a complete novice is open to question, but, as a summary for a theological student or a quick reference book for a priest, it is ideal.

R. Tatlock.

London.

The Blessed Virgin. By Jean Guitton. Burns Oates. 16s.

If Falstaff dined on a little bread and an intolerable deal of sack, books on Mariology combine fact with speculation in much the same ratio. Guitton's book is no exception, but for several reasons it is of more than usual interest. The author writes as a moderate (though even a moderate Roman Catholic position is bound to appear well forward), he does make contact with the critics at many points, he has given his book an original plan, and its pages are lit by the graceful spirit of a man who is both a philosopher and a poet.

Not without shrewdness, he probes the shadows that lie behind the meagre facts of Mary's earthly life and comments on the development of Marian doctrines within the Church. There follows a section on Mary as the Glorified Virgin and another on the importance of this symbol in the present age. It is by no irrelevance that there is introduced into what is a theological discussion some account of the phenomena of apparitions of the Virgin that, from La Salette to Beauraing, are as bewildering to our age as the advent of flying saucers, for the local cults arising from these phenomena are playing an equal part with the Marian doctrines in shaping Roman Catholic devotional ideas.

Obviously a considerable mystery attaches to her who "was found with child of the Holy Ghost". While the Protestant tradition, shrinking from so great a riddle, has chosen to disregard Mary except as a temporary tool in the hand of God, the Roman Catholic tradition, by a continual return upon the problem, has built up in Mariology what amounts to a substantial annexe to the Christian faith. Meanwhile, between these extremes, there is still standing-room for those who, while holding in awe the mystery of the Virgin-mother, prefer not to crown it, not indeed to vulgarize it, with too many dogmas.

Victor Bennett.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES

SIR,

This letter having travelled eleven thousand miles arrives on your table as a result of Dr Robinson's article in the June number of THEOLOGY, entitled "The Theological College in a Changing World".

I write from a country at war and broken by war, a country, too, in which during these present days a political crisis of very great gravity is threatening the last threads of cohesion which the U.N. is trying to maintain here. I write, then, from a country in the kind of state which may become endemic in the second half of the twentieth century about which Dr Robinson is concerned. Therefore, from the point of view of the Church, the situation here appears wide open to the four winds of heaven, but not exceptional to our day.

You may protest that this is no atmosphere in which to consider the needs of theological training in England, but I would reply that in Korea to-day can be clearly seen the raw material of the world for which Dr Robinson wants our priests trained. Above all I want to say in the simplest words that in this unformed situation, as in any such, two things do not change—the need of human souls and the nature of human sin. I am forced to believe that the "techniques" of a priesthood trained for "the managerial society", of which Dr Robinson writes, or of a medieval agricultural society, are "techniques" of very little moment, in comparison with the impact of the priestly life which our present theological colleges are better fitted to invigorate than any other suggested system.

Dr Robinson claims that the rapid development of society in the nineteenth century "challenged the adequacy of amateur leadership in every field". He writes further that, for this reason, "Training for leadership became a conscious social enterprise". I can only say, as one who has grown up in that conscious social enterprise, would to God my generation had enjoyed the amateur leadership of our fathers' days. Too often our own has been a sorry thing.

I have had occasion in the past fifteen years to see something of the work of the theological colleges of the Episcopal Church of the United States, which are in many respects nearer to Dr Robinson's ideal. Let me boast further, I have in that period seen not a little leadership, ecclesiastical and lay, in America North and South and in various countries of the Far East. But all these things confirm me in the belief that Dr Robinson is arguing from a false premise to a wrong conclusion. Our theological colleges are far from perfect, but for that reason I humbly suggest that they need not a change or a transformation to something different, but a greater fidelity to their present nature.

Finally, from this elemental little peninsula, I would have one further sting in the tail of my rash letter.

We can claim to need priests here as badly or more so than any diocese of the Anglican communion. The situation is so fluid that, as a diocese, our expectation of life is as bad as any in that communion. But I believe that the priest who is required is not one trained for any particular society, nor equipped with any technique, but one trained to fulfil the requirements of the Bishop's charge in the Form for the Ordering of Priests of our Prayer Book. And because Korea is not different from England except in that life is more raw and nearer the bone, we, like England, want, not a new type of priest, but a better production of the old.

Yours truly,
PAUL BURROUGH.

ENGLISH CHURCH MISSION IN KOREA,
C/o BRITISH LEGATION,
PUSAN, B.A.P.O. 3.
14 *June* 1952.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: G. A. Buttrick, *Faith and Education* ($2.00).
ALDEN AND BLACKWELL: H. P. V. Nunn, *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (7s. 6d.).
ALLEN AND UNWIN: T. Henshaw, *New Testament Literature* (25s); E. L. Stockman, *Religious Dances* (35s.).
ASSOCIATION FOR WORLD PEACE: *War on Want: a plan for world development* (1s.).
BATCHWORTH PRESS: A. S. Duncan-Jones, *What is Peace?* (1s. 6d.).
CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: The Archbishop of Canterbury, *The Church and Marriage* [Evidence presented to the Royal Commission] (1s. 6d.).
CLONMORE AND REYNOLDS: Line de Thioles, *Eucharistic Reparation* (3s.); C. J. Barrett, *Adoption* (6s.).
FABER AND FABER: Jan van Ruysbroek, *The Spiritual Espousals* (18s.); W. Hilton, *The Goad of Love* (18s.).
GOLLANCZ: Gordon Westwood, *Society and the Homosexual* (9s. 6d.).
LETOUZEY ET ANÉ (PARIS): *Dictionnaire de la Bible* Fascicule XXV Langdon-Loi Israélite (n.p.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: A. C. Welch, *Kings and Prophets of Israel* (18s.).
MOWBRAY: A Religious of the C.S.M.V. (Ed.), *St Bernard on the Song of Songs* (Sermones in Cantica Canticorum) (12s. 6d.); Theodar Klaveer, *The Western Liturgy and its History* (4s.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *Father Douglass of Behala* (10s. 6d.); J. S. Trimingham, *Islam in Ethiopia* (25s.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: A. W. F. Blunt, *What the Church teaches* (revised edition) (2s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: *Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions* (2s. 6d.); E. Brunner, *The Church in the New Social Order* (3s. 6d.); Willy Kramp, *Prophecy* (7s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: O. S. Tomkins, *Three Meanings of East and West* (1s.); N. E. Robbins, *Greater is He* (8s. 6d.); G. Allen, *Christ, the West and the East* (1s.).
VERLAG LAMBERT SCHNEIDER (HEIDELBERG): Hans Ehrenberg, *Hiob der Existentialist* (n.p.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher